IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent No.:	6,812,636	Issue Date:	2 November 2004
Application No.:	09/823,815	Confirmation No.:	6595
First Named Inventor:	Porter, John D.	Filing Date:	30 March 2001
Group Art Unit:	2879	Examiner:	Guharay, K.
Atty. Docket No.:	CDST-F139		
Title:	Light-Emitting Device Having Partially Coated Light-Emissive Particles		
Assignees:	Canon Kabushiki Kaisha and Sony Corporation		

Los Angeles, California
October 14, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION BRANCH
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION UNDER 35 USC 254 AND 37 CFR 1.322 AND POSSIBLY UNDER 35 USC 255 AND 37 CFR 1.323

Sir:

Patentees' Attorney requests a Certificate of Correction under 35 USC 254 and 37 CFR 1.322, and possibly under 35 USC 255 and 37 CFR 1.323, to correct various errors in the above patent. Enclosed are two versions of the proposed Certificate of Correction. Patentees' Attorney requests that the PTO choose one of the two proposed versions of the proposed Certificate of Correction and issue that version as the Certificate of Correction for the above patent.

The errors in the above patent all involve the claims as presented in the Amendment submitted 25 February 2004.

Application Claim 107, which was presented as a new dependent claim in the 25 February 2004 Amendment, recited "A structure as in Claim 106 wherein each of a plural

number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle". Application Claim 107 became patent Claim 33 which recites "A structure as in claim 32 wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally confonnally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle".

Patent Claim 33 is incorrect in that the PTO erroneously printed "conformally" in application Claim 107 as "confonnally" in patent Claim 33. That is, the PTO erroneously printed the letter combination "r" and "m" in "conformally" as two consecutive letters "n". Accordingly, patent Claim 33 should be corrected by changing "confonnally" to "conformally".

Application Claim 134, which likewise was presented as a new dependent claim in the 25 February 2004 Amendment, recited "A structure as in Claim 133 further including a light-reflective layer overlying the getter coatings above the light-emissive regions, the light-reflective layer being perforated where it overlies the light-emissive regions". Application Claim 134 became patent Claim 68 which recites "A structure as in claim 67 further including a light-reflective layer overlying the getter coatings above the light-emissive regions, the light-reflective layer being perforated where it overlies the light-ernissive regions".

Patent Claim 68 is incorrect in that the PTO erroneously printed "light-emissive", second occurrence, in application Claim 134 as "light-ernissive" in patent Claim 68. That is, the PTO erroneously printed the letter "m" in "light-emissive", second occurrence, as the letter "r" followed by the letter "n". Hence, patent Claim 68 should be corrected by changing "light-ernissive" to "light-emissive".

The remaining errors to be corrected by one of the enclosed versions of the proposed Certificate of Correction are incorrect dependencies for patent Claims 16, 60 - 62, 71, and 72 respectively presented as new application Claims 140, 131, 132, 139, 137, and 138 in the 25 February 2004 Amendment.

First consider dependent patent Claims 60 and 61 repeated below along with (a) independent patent Claim 52 from which patent Claims 60 and 61 depend (directly or indirectly) and (b) dependent patent Claims 58 and 59 which also depend (directly or indirectly) from patent Claim 52:

52. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a multiplicity of laterally separated light-emissive regions overlying light-transmissive material of the plate, each light-emissive region comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a like multiplicity of groups of light-reflective coatings substantially reflective of visible light, the groups of light-reflective coatings respectively corresponding to the light-emissive regions, each light-reflective coating of each group generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles of the corresponding light-emissive region so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

58. A structure as in claim 52 further including an electron-emitting device comprising a like multiplicity of laterally separated electron-emissive regions respectively situated generally opposite the light-emissive regions, each electron-emissive region emitting electrons which pass through the light-reflective coatings of the light-emissive particles in the oppositely situated light-emissive region and cause those light-emissive particles to emit light.

59. A structure as in claim 58 wherein the light-reflective coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles.

60. A structure as in claim 52 further including an electron-emitting device comprising a like multiplicity of laterally separated electron-emissive regions respectively situated generally opposite the light-emissive regions, each electron-emissive region emitting electrons which pass through the coatings of the light-emissive particles in the oppositely situated light-emissive region and cause those light-emissive particles to emit light.

61. A structure as in claim 60 wherein the coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles.

Patent Claims 58 and 60 both depend directly from patent Claim 52 and are phrased the same except that except that patent Claim 58 recites "the light-reflective coatings" whereas patent Claim 60 simply recites "the coatings". However, the only "coatings" recited in independent patent Claim 52 are "light-reflective coatings". Consequently, dependent patent Claims 58 and 60 claim identically the same material.

It is a fundamental principle of U.S. patent law that a utility U.S. patent may not properly present two (or more) patent claims that claim identically the same material. Hence,

one of patent Claims 58 and 60 cannot properly be present in the above patent as dependent from patent Claim 52.

In a similar manner, patent Claims 59 and 61 respectively depend directly from dependent patent Claims 58 and 60 and are substantively phrased the same except that patent Claim 59 recites "the light-reflective coatings" whereas patent Claim 61 simply recites "the coatings". Since the only "coatings" recited in independent patent Claim 52 are "light-reflective coatings", dependent patent Claims 59 and 61 claim identically the same material. Because a utility U.S. patent may not present two or more patent claims that claim identically the same material, one of patent Claims 59 and 61 cannot properly be present in the above patent as dependent from patent Claim 52 respectively via patent Claims 58 and 60. More particularly, the above patent may properly present only (a) patent Claims 58 and 59 as dependent from independent patent Claim 52 or (b) patent Claims 60 and 61 as dependent from patent Claim 52.

For the reasons presented after the following discussion of the dependency errors in patent Claims 62 and 16, patent Claims 58 and 59 properly depend from independent patent Claim 52. The dependencies of patent Claims 60 and 61 on patent Claim 52 are erroneous. In this regard, the dependency of patent Claim 61 on patent Claim 60 is numerically correct but is overall incorrect due to the incorrect dependency of patent Claim 61 on patent Claim 52.

Moving to dependent patent Claim 62, it is repeated below:

> 62. A structure as in claim 52 further including an electron-emitting device comprising a like multiplicity of laterally separated electron-emissive regions respectively situated generally opposite the light-emissive regions, each electron-emissive region emitting electrons which pass through the getter coatings of the light-emissive particles in the oppositely situated light-emissive region and cause those light-emissive particles to emit light.

As with patent Claims 58 and 60, patent Claim 62 depends directly from independent patent Claim 52. In addition, patent Claim 62 is phrased the same as patent Claims 58 and 60 except that patent Claim 62 recites "the getter coatings" in the last clause of the claim whereas (a) patent Claim 58 recites "the light-reflective coatings" in its last clause and (b) patent Claim 60 simply recites "the coatings" in its last clause.

No "getter coatings" are recited in dependent patent Claim 62 prior to its last clause. Although "light-reflective coatings" are recited in independent patent Claim 52 from which dependent patent Claim 62 directly depends, no "getter coatings" are recited in independent patent Claim 52. Dependent patent Claim 62 therefore lacks antecedent basis for "the getter coatings". As a result, dependent patent Claim 62 cannot properly depend from independent patent Claim 52.

If, arguendo, weight were not given to the adjective "getter" in the term "the getter coatings" in dependent patent Claim 62, it would claim identically the same material as dependent patent Claims 58 and 60. Inasmuch as a utility U.S. patent may not properly present two or more patent claims that claim identically the same material, two of patent Claims 58, 60, and 62 cannot properly be present in the above patent as depending from patent Claim 52. This is a reason why weight must be given to the adjective "getter" in patent Claim 62 and therefore an additional reason why patent Claim 62 cannot properly depend from independent patent Claim 52.

Next, consider dependent patent Claim 16 repeated below along with (a) independent patent Claim 11 from which patent Claim 16 depends via dependent patent Claim 14, (b) dependent patent Claim 15 which likewise depends from patent Claim 11 via patent Claim 14, and (c) patent Claim 14:

> 11. A structure comprising:
>
> a plate;
>
> a light-emissive region overlying light-transmissive material of the plate and comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and
>
> a group of coatings comprising at least one Group IIIB (13) metal, each coating generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.
>
> 14. A structure as in claim 11 further including an electron-emitting device comprising an electron-emissive region for emitting electrons which pass through the coatings and cause the light-emissive particles to emit light.
>
> 15. A structure as in claim 14 wherein the coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive region impinge on the light-emissive particles.

16. A structure as in claim 14 wherein the getter coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles.

As mentioned above, patent Claims 15 and 16 both depend from independent patent Claim 11 via dependent patent Claim 14. In addition, patent Claim 16 is phrased the same as patent Claim 15 except that patent Claim 16 recites "the getter coatings" at the beginning of the substantive portion whereas patent Claim 15 simply recites "the coatings" at the beginning of its substantive portion.

No "getter coatings" are recited in dependent patent Claim 14 from which patent Claim 16 directly depends. Although "coatings" are recited in independent patent Claim 11 from which dependent patent Claim 16 depends via dependent patent Claim 14, no "getter coatings" are recited in independent patent Claim 11. Hence, dependent patent Claim 16 lacks antecedent basis for "the getter coatings". Dependent patent Claim 16 therefore cannot properly depend from independent patent Claim 11 via dependent patent Claim 14.

If, arguendo, weight were not given to the adjective "getter" in the term "the getter coatings" in dependent patent Claim 16, it would claim identically the same material as dependent patent Claim 15. Since a utility U.S. patent may not properly present two or more patent claims that claim identically the same material, one of patent Claims 15 and 16 cannot properly be present in the above patent as depending from patent Claim 11. This is a reason why weight must be given to the adjective "getter" in patent Claim 16 and thus an additional reason why patent Claim 16 cannot properly depend from independent patent Claim 11 via dependent patent Claim 14.

As to correcting the foregoing dependency errors in patent Claims 16 and 60 - 62, the 25 February 2004 Amendment presented four groups of new application claims that respectively began with new independent application Claims 111, 119, 127, and 133. These four groups of application claims, which include application Claims 131, 132, 139, and 140 that respectively became patent Claims 60 - 62 and 16, are repeated below in relevant part:

111. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a light-emissive region overlying light-transmissive material of the plate and comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a group of light-reflective coatings consisting largely of non-oxidized metal, each light-reflective coating generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

.

.

.

116. A structure as in Claim 115 wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

117. A structure as in Claim 111 further including an electron-emitting device comprising an electron-emissive region for emitting electrons which pass through the light-reflective coatings and cause the light-emissive particles to emit light.

118. A structure as in Claim 117 wherein the light-reflective coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive region impinge on the light-emissive particles.

119. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a multiplicity of laterally separated light-emissive regions overlying light-transmissive material of the plate, each light-emissive region comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a like multiplicity of groups of light-reflective coatings substantially reflective of visible light, the groups of light-reflective coatings respectively corresponding to the light-emissive regions, each light-reflective coating of each group generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles of the corresponding light-emissive region so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

.

.

.

124. A structure as in Claim 123 wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

125. A structure as in Claim 119 further including an electron-emitting device comprising a like multiplicity of laterally separated electron-emissive regions respectively situated generally opposite the light-emissive regions,

each electron-emissive region emitting electrons which pass through the light-reflective coatings of the light-emissive particles in the oppositely situated light-emissive region and cause those light-emissive particles to emit light.

126. A structure as in Claim 125 wherein the light-reflective coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles.

127. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a multiplicity of laterally separated light-emissive regions overlying light-transmissive material of the plate, each light-emissive region comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a like multiplicity of groups of coatings comprising at least one of beryllium, boron, magnesium, aluminum, titanium, vanadium, chromium, manganese, iron, cobalt, nickel, copper, gallium, zirconium, niobium, molybdenum, palladium, silver, indium, barium, tantalum, tungsten, platinum, thallium, lead, thorium, and oxide of at least one of magnesium, chromium, manganese, cobalt, nickel, and lead, the groups of coatings respectively corresponding to the light-emissive regions, each coating of each group generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles of the corresponding light-emissive region so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

.

.

.

130. A structure as in Claim 129 wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

131. A structure as in Claim 119 further including an electron-emitting device comprising a like multiplicity of laterally separated electron-emissive regions respectively situated generally opposite the light-emissive regions, each electron-emissive region emitting electrons which pass through the coatings of the light-emissive particles in the oppositely situated light-emissive region and cause those light-emissive particles to emit light.

132. A structure as in Claim 131 wherein the coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles.

133. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a multiplicity of laterally separated light-emissive regions overlying light-transmissive material of the plate, each light-emissive region comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a like multiplicity of groups of getter coatings, the groups of getter coatings respectively corresponding to the light-emissive regions, each getter coating of each group generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles of the corresponding light-emissive region so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

.

.

.

138. A structure as in Claim 137 wherein each of a plural number of the getter coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

139. A structure as in Claim 119 further including an electron-emitting device comprising a like multiplicity of laterally separated electron-emissive regions respectively situated generally opposite the light-emissive regions, each electron-emissive region emitting electrons which pass through the getter coatings of the light-emissive particles in the oppositely situated light-emissive region and cause those light-emissive particles to emit light.

140. A structure as in Claim 12 wherein the getter coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles.

Examination of the preceding application claims, as presented in the 25 February 2004 Amendment, shows that each of the first two groups of new application claims, i.e., the groups beginning with independent application Claims 111 and 119, ended with three dependent claims, Nos. 116 - 118 for application Claim 111 and Nos. 124 - 126 for application Claim 119, respectively directed to (i) a plural number of the coatings extending generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle, (ii) an electron-emitting device comprising one or more electron-emissive regions for emitting electrons which pass through the coatings and cause the light-emissive particles to emit light, and (iii) the coatings reducing damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive region impinge on the light-emissive particles.

The third and fourth groups of new application claims presented in the 25 February 2004 Amendment respectively began with independent application Claims 127 and 133 respectively corresponding to patent Claims 63 and 67. Instead of ending with two dependent claims respectively directed to (a) an electron-emitting device comprising one or more electron-emissive regions for emitting electrons which pass through the coatings and cause the light-emissive particles to emit light and (b) the coatings reducing damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive region impinge on the light-emissive particles, each of the third and fourth groups of new application claims seemingly ended with a dependent application claim, No. 130 for independent application Claim 127 and No. 138 for independent application Claim 133, directed to directed to a plural number of the coatings extending generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

Application Claim 130 which depended from independent application Claim 127 in the third group of new application claims in the 25 February 2004 Amendment is, however, immediately followed by dependent application Claims 131 and 132 respectively directed to (a) an electron-emitting device comprising multiple electron-emissive regions for emitting electrons which pass through the coatings and cause the light-emissive particles to emit light and (b) the coatings reducing damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles. Instead of being recited as dependent (directly or indirectly) from independent application Claim 127 in the third group of new application claims, application Claim 131 was recited as dependent from application Claim "119", the independent application claim in the second group of new application claims. Application Claim 132 was recited as dependent from application Claim 131 and therefore also depended (indirectly) from independent application Claim 119 in the second group of new application claims.

From the logical structure of the claims in the third group of new application claims in light of the logical structure of the claims in the first two groups of new application claims, from the fact that the above patent can properly present only (a) patent Claims 58 and 59 as dependent from independent patent Claim 52 or (b) patent Claims 60 and 61 as dependent from patent Claim 52, and from the fact that application Claims 127, 131, and 132 respectively correspond to patent Claims 63, 60, and 61, it is clear that application Claim 131 corresponding to patent Claim 60 should have depended from independent application Claim

127 corresponding to independent patent Claim 63. Hence, patent Claim 60 should depend from patent Claim 63.

Application Claim 132, which was directed to having the coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles, must depend from an application claim reciting multiple electron-emissive regions in order for application Claim 132 to have proper antecedent basis. In view of this requirement and the comments made in the preceding paragraph, it is clear that application Claim 132 corresponding to patent Claim 61 should have depended from application Claim 127 via application Claim 131. Accordingly, patent Claim 61 should depend from patent Claim 63 via patent Claim 60.

Application Claim 138 which depends from independent application Claim 133 in the fourth group of new application claims in the 25 February 2004 Amendment is immediately followed by dependent application Claims 139 and 140 respectively directed to (a) an electron-emitting device comprising multiple electron-emissive regions for emitting electrons which pass through the coatings and cause the light-emissive particles to emit light and (b) the coatings reducing damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive region impinge on the light-emissive particles. Instead of being recited as dependent (directly or indirectly) from independent application Claim 133 in the fourth group of new application claims, application Claim 139 was recited as dependent from application Claim "119", the independent application claim in the second group of new application claims.

From the logical structure of the claims in the fourth group of new application claims in light of the logical structure of the claims in the first two groups of new application claims, from the fact that patent Claim 62 lacks antecedent basis for its recitation of "the getter regions" in its current dependency from patent Claim 52, and from the fact that application Claims 133 and 139 respectively correspond to patent Claims 67 and 62, it is clear that application Claim 139 corresponding to patent Claim 62 should have depended from independent application Claim 133 corresponding to independent patent Claim 67. As a result, patent Claim 62 should depend from patent Claim 67.

Application Claim 140 was, in the 25 February 2004 Amendment, recited as dependent from application Claim "12" instead of being recited as dependent (directly or

indirectly) from independent application Claim 133 in the fourth group of new application claims. Analogous to what was said about application Claim 132, application Claim 140 directed to having the coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles must depend on an application claim reciting multiple electron-emissive regions in order for application Claim 140 to have proper antecedent basis. In view of this requirement and the comments made in the preceding two paragraphs, it is clear that application Claim 140 corresponding to patent Claim 16 should have depended on application Claim 133 via application Claim 139. Consequently, patent Claim 16 should depend from patent Claim 67 via patent Claim 62.

Patentees' Attorney realizes that the errors in the dependencies of patent Claims 16 and 60 - 62 arose from the erroneous dependencies of respectively corresponding application Claims 140, 131, 132, and 139 as presented in the 25 February 2004 Amendment, the dependency of patent Claim 61 on patent Claim 60 being numerically correct but being overall incorrect due to the incorrect dependency of patent Claim 60. However, the PTO is obligated to assure that claims in U.S. utility patents meet the appropriate legal standards. In particular, the PTO is obligated to avoid issuance of a utility U.S. patent which presents two or more patent claims that claim identically the same material or which presents patent claims that lack proper antecedent basis for items recited in the claims. Consequently, the issuance of the above patent with the claims dependency errors in patent Claims 16 and 60 - 62 is also the fault of the PTO. The correction of these claim dependency errors via a Certificate of Correction is therefore justified.

Moving to patent Claims 71 and 72, patent Claim 71 is recited as dependent from dependent patent Claim 62 but numerically follows independent patent Claim 67. Patent Claim 71 corresponds to application Claim 137 which depended from independent application Claim 133 corresponding to independent patent Claim 67. Accordingly, the dependency of patent Claim 71 should be corrected from patent Claim 62 to patent Claim 67.

Patent Claim 72 depends from patent Claim 71 and thus from independent patent Claim 62 due to the erroneous recited dependence of patent Claim 71 on patent Claim 62. Patent Claim 72 corresponds to application Claim 138 which depended from independent application Claim 133 via application Claim 137. Since application Claims 133 and 137 respectively correspond to patent Claims 67 and 71, patent Claim 72 should depend from

patent Claim 67 via patent Claim 71. In this regard, the dependency of patent Claim 72 on patent Claim 71 is numerically correct but is overall incorrect due to the incorrect dependency of patent Claim 71 on patent Claim 62.

Patentees' Attorney is unsure how the claim dependency errors should be corrected because patent Claims 16 and 60 - 62 are numerically separated from the independent patent claims from which they should depend.

Perhaps the easiest way of correcting the claim dependency errors is to simply change the recited incorrect dependencies of patent Claims 16, 60, 62, and 71 to the correct dependencies. Correcting the dependencies of patent Claims 16, 60, 62, and 71 in this way will inherently correct the incorrect overall dependencies of patent Claims 61 and 72. One of the enclosed versions of the proposed Certificate of Correction corrects the claim dependency errors by simply changing the recited incorrect dependencies of patent Claims 16, 60, 62, and 71 to the correct dependencies.

Claims in U.S. utility patents are normally arranged so that dependent patent claims depend on lower-numbered patent claims. Correcting the claim dependency errors in the preceding way will lead to some of the dependent patent claims being dependent on higher-numbered patent claims in contravention of the normal PTO utility-patent claim numbering standard. Accordingly, the other (second) of the enclosed versions of the proposed Certificate of Correction corrects the claim dependency errors by suitably renumbering the patent claims and correcting the erroneous dependencies of the renumbered patent claims corresponding to patent Claims 16, 60, 62, and 71 so that each dependent patent claim depends from a lower-numbered patent claim.

In renumbering the claims in the second version of the proposed Certificate of Correction, originally numbered patent Claims 16 - 72 respectively become renumbered patent Claims 72, 16 - 60, 63, 64, 71, 59 - 61, and 65 - 70 with the claim dependencies adjusted to accommodate the claim renumbering subject to the claim dependency changes requested here. The second version of the proposed Certificate of Correction presents patent Claims 16 - 72 as renumbered in the foregoing way. Originally numbered patent Claim 33 becomes renumbered patent Claim 32 in which "confonnally" is corrected to "conformally" as requested here. Originally numbered patent Claim 68 similarly becomes renumbered patent Claim 66 in which "light-ernissive" is corrected to "light-emissive" as requested here.

Repeating what was stated near the beginning of this Request, Patentees' Attorney requests that the PTO choose one of the two proposed versions of the proposed Certificate of Correction and issue that version as the Certificate of Correction for the above patent.

To the extent that this request for a Certificate of Correction falls under the provisions of 35 USC 255 and 37 CFR 1.323 for correcting an error due to mistake of applicant(s), the amount of **$100.00** to cover the official fees for such a certificate has been paid concurrently with the submission of this request.

Please telephone Patentees' Attorney at (323) 934-2300 if there are any questions in regard to this request for a Certificate of Correction.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted electronically to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on October 14, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert Popa 43010/

Robert Popa
Attorney for Applicants
LADAS & PARRY LLP
Reg. No. 43,010
5670 Wilshire Blvd. #2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036
Telephone:(323)934-2300
Telefax:(323)934-0202

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION

PATENT NO. : 6,812,636

APPLICATION NO. : 09/823,815

ISSUE DATE : 2 November 2004

INVENTOR(S) : Porter et al.

It is certified that error appears in the above-identified patent and that said Letters Patent is hereby corrected as shown below:

Claim 16, first line, "as in claim **14**" should read "as in claim **62**";

Claim 33, third line, "confonnally" should read "conformally";

Claim 60, first line, "as in claim **52**" should read "as in claim **63**";

Claim 62, first line, "as in claim **52**" should read "as in claim **67**";

Claim 68, fourth line, "light-ernissive" should read "light-emissive"; and

Claim 71, first line, "as in claim **62**" should read "as in claim **67**".

MAILING ADDRESS OF SENDER:
Ladas & Parry LLP
5670 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Robert Popa
Attorney for Patentee(s)
Reg. No. 43010

SEND TO: **Attention: Certificate of Corrections Branch, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION

PATENT NO. : 6,812,636

APPLICATION NO. : 09/823,815

ISSUE DATE : 2 November 2004

INVENTOR(S) : Porter et al.

It is certified that error appears in the above-identified patent and that said Letters Patent is hereby corrected as shown below:

Claims 16 - 72 should read as follows:

16. A structure as in claim **11** wherein the outer surface of each light-emissive particle consists of (a) a lower half surface closest to the plate and (b) an upper half surface farthest from the plate, each coating extending generally conformally along at least part of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

17. A structure as in claim **16** wherein each of a plural number of the coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

18. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a light-emissive region overlying light-transmissive material of the plate and comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles for emitting blue light, each light-emissive particle having an outer surface; and

a group of coatings comprising at least one of boron, aluminum, gallium, silver, indium, and thallium, each coating generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

19. A structure as in claim **18** wherein the light-emissive particles comprise metal sulfide phosphors with silver substitution.

20. A structure as in claim **18** wherein the outer surface of each light-emissive particle consists of (a) a lower half surface closest to the plate and (b) an upper half surface farthest from the plate, each coating extending generally conformally along at least part of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

21. A structure as in claim **20** wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

22. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a light-emissive region overlying light-transmissive material of the plate and comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles for emitting green light, each light-emissive particle having an outer surface; and

a group of coatings comprising at least one of boron, aluminum, copper, gallium, indium, and thallium, each coating generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

23. A structure as in claim **22** wherein the light-emissive particles comprise metal sulfide phosphors with copper substitution.

24. A structure as in claim **22** wherein the outer surface of each light-emissive particle consists of (a) a lower half surface closest to the plate and (b) an upper half surface farthest from the plate, each coating extending generally conformally along at least part of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

25. A structure as in claim **24** wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

26. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a light-emissive region overlying light-transmissive material of the plate and comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a group of coatings comprising at least one of beryllium, boron, magnesium, aluminum, titanium, vanadium, chromium, manganese, iron, cobalt, nickel, copper, gallium, zirconium, niobium, molybdenum, palladium, silver, indium, barium, tantalum, tungsten, platinum, thallium, lead, thorium, and oxide of at least one of magnesium, chromium, manganese, cobalt, nickel, and lead, each coating generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

27. A structure as in claim **26** further including a light-reflective layer overlying the coatings above the light-emissive region, the light-reflective layer being generally flat where it overlies the light-emissive region.

28. A structure as in claim **26** wherein the light-emissive particles comprise metal sulfide phosphors.

29. A structure as in claim **26** further including an electron-emitting device comprising an electron-emissive region for emitting electrons which pass through the coatings and cause the light-emissive particles to emit light.

30. A structure as in claim **29** wherein the coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive region impinge on the light-emissive particles.

31. A structure as in claim **26** wherein the outer surface of each light-emissive particle consists of (a) a lower half surface closest to the plate and (b) an upper half surface farthest from the plate, each coating extending generally conformally along at least part of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

32. A structure as in claim **31** wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

33. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a light-emissive region overlying light-transmissive material of the plate and comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a group of getter coatings, each generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding one of the light-emissive particles so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

34. A structure as in claim **33** further including a light-reflective layer overlying the getter coatings above the light-emissive region, the light-reflective layer being generally flat where it overlies the light-emissive region.

35. A structure as in claim **33** further including a light-reflective layer overlying the getter coatings above the light-emissive region, the light-reflective layer being perforated where it overlies the light-emissive region.

36. A structure as in claim **33** wherein the getter coatings are light reflective.

37. A structure as in claim **33** wherein the getter coatings comprise at least one of magnesium, titanium, vanadium, chromium, manganese, iron, cobalt, nickel, copper, zirconium, niobium, molybdenum, palladium, silver, barium, tantalum, tungsten, platinum, lead, thorium, and oxide of at least one of magnesium, chromium, manganese, cobalt, nickel, and lead.

38. A structure as in claim **33** wherein the getter coatings sorb sulfur.

39. A structure as in claim **33** further including an electron-emitting device comprising an electron-emissive region for emitting electrons which pass through the getter coatings and cause the light-emissive particles to emit light.

40. A structure as in claim **39** wherein the getter coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive region impinge on the light-emissive particles.

41. A structure as in claim **33** wherein the outer surface of each light-emissive particle consists of (a) a lower half surface closest to the plate and (b) an upper half surface farthest from the plate, each coating extending generally conformally along at least part of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

42. A structure as in claim **41** wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

43. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a light-emissive region overlying light-transmissive material of the plate and comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a group of light-reflective coatings consisting largely of non-oxidized metal, each light-reflective coating generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

44. A structure as in claim **43** wherein the light-reflective coatings consist of substantially pure metal.

45. A structure as in claim **43** further including a light-reflective layer overlying the light-reflective coatings above the light-emissive region, the light-reflective layer being generally flat where it overlies the light-emissive region.

46. A structure as in claim **43** wherein the metal of the light-reflective coatings comprises at least one of beryllium, boron, magnesium, aluminum, chromium, manganese, iron, cobalt, nickel, copper, gallium, molybdenum, palladium, silver, indium, platinum, thallium, and lead.

47. A structure as in claim **43** wherein the outer surface of each light-emissive particle consists of (a) a lower half surface closest to the plate and (b) an upper half surface farthest from the plate, each light-reflective coating extending generally conformally along at least part of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

48. A structure as in claim **47** wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

49. A structure as in claim **43** further including an electron-emitting device comprising an electron-emissive region for emitting electrons which pass through the light-reflective coatings and cause the light-emissive particles to emit light.

50. A structure as in claim **49** wherein the light-reflective coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive region impinge on the light-emissive particles.

51. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a multiplicity of laterally separated light-emissive regions overlying light-transmissive material of the plate, each light-emissive region comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a like multiplicity of groups of light-reflective coatings substantially reflective of visible light, the groups of light-reflective coatings respectively corresponding to the light-emissive regions, each light-reflective coating of each group generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles of the corresponding light-emissive region so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

52. A structure as in claim **51** further including a light-reflective layer overlying the light-reflective coatings above the light-emissive regions, the light-reflective layer being generally flat where it overlies the light-emissive regions.

53. A structure as in claim **51** wherein the light-reflective coatings consist largely of metal.

54. A structure as in claim **53** wherein the metal of the light-reflective coatings comprises at least one of beryllium, boron, magnesium, aluminum, chromium, manganese, iron, cobalt, nickel, copper, gallium, molybdenum, palladium, silver, indium, platinum, thallium, and lead.

55. A structure as in claim **51** wherein the outer surface of each light-emissive particle consists of (a) a lower half surface closest to the plate and (b) an upper half surface farthest from the plate, each light-reflective coating extending generally conformally along at least part of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

56. A structure as in claim **55** wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

57. A structure as in claim **51** further including an electron-emitting device comprising a like multiplicity of laterally separated electron-emissive regions respectively situated generally opposite the light-emissive regions, each electron-emissive region emitting electrons which pass through the light-reflective coatings of the light-emissive particles in the oppositely situated light-emissive region and cause those light-emissive particles to emit light.

58. A structure as in claim **57** wherein the light-reflective coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles.

59. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a multiplicity of laterally separated light-emissive regions overlying light-transmissive material of the plate, each light-emissive region comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a like multiplicity of groups of coatings comprising at least one of beryllium, boron, magnesium, aluminum, titanium, vanadium, chromium, manganese, iron, cobalt, nickel, copper, gallium, zirconium, niobium, molybdenum, palladium, silver, indium, barium, tantalum, tungsten, platinum, thallium, lead, thorium, and oxide of at least one of magnesium, chromium, manganese, cobalt, nickel, and lead, the groups of coatings respectively corresponding to the light-emissive regions, each coating of each group generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles of the corresponding light-emissive region so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

60. A structure as in claim **59** further including a light-reflective layer overlying the coatings above the light-emissive regions, the light-reflective layer being generally flat where it overlies the light-emissive regions.

61. A structure as in claim **59** wherein the outer surface of each light-emissive particle consists of (a) a lower half surface closest to the plate and (b) an upper half surface farthest from the plate, each coating extending generally conformally along at least part of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

62. A structure as in claim **61** wherein each of a plural number of the light-reflective coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

63. A structure as in claim **59** further including an electron-emitting device comprising a like multiplicity of laterally separated electron-emissive regions respectively situated generally opposite the light-emissive regions, each electron-emissive region emitting electrons which pass through the coatings of the light-emissive particles in the oppositely situated light-emissive region and cause those light-emissive particles to emit light.

64. A structure as in claim **63** wherein the coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles.

65. A structure comprising:

a plate;

a multiplicity of laterally separated light-emissive regions overlying light-transmissive material of the plate, each light-emissive region comprising a plurality of light-emissive particles each having an outer surface; and

a like multiplicity of groups of getter coatings, the groups of getter coatings respectively corresponding to the light-emissive regions, each getter coating of each group generally conformally overlying part of the outer surface of a corresponding different one of the light-emissive particles of the corresponding light-emissive region so as to be spaced apart from where that light-emissive particle is closest to the plate.

66. A structure as in claim **65** further including a light-reflective layer overlying the getter coatings above the light-emissive regions, the light-reflective layer being perforated where it overlies the light-emissive regions.

67. A structure as in claim **65** wherein the getter coatings are light reflective.

68. A structure as in claim **65** wherein the getter coatings comprise at least one of magnesium, titanium, vanadium, chromium, manganese, iron, cobalt, nickel, copper, zirconium, niobium, molybdenum, palladium, silver, barium, tantalum, tungsten, platinum, lead, thorium, and oxide of at least one of magnesium, chromium, manganese, cobalt, nickel, and lead.

69. A structure as in claim **65** wherein the outer surface of each light-emissive particle consists of (a) a lower half surface closest to the plate and (b) an upper half surface farthest from the plate, each getter coating extending generally conformally along at least part of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

70. A structure as in claim **69** wherein each of a plural number of the getter coatings extends generally conformally along largely all of the upper half surface of the corresponding light-emissive particle.

71. A structure as in claim **65** further including an electron-emitting device comprising a like multiplicity of laterally separated electron-emissive regions respectively situated generally opposite the light-emissive regions, each electron-emissive region emitting electrons which pass through the getter coatings of the light-emissive particles in the oppositely situated light-emissive region and cause those light-emissive particles to emit light.

72. A structure as in claim **71** wherein the getter coatings reduce damage that occurs to the light-emissive particles as electrons emitted by the electron-emissive regions impinge on the light-emissive particles.

MAILING ADDRESS OF SENDER:
Ladas & Parry LLP
5670 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Robert Popa
Attorney for Patentee(s)
Reg. No. 43010